REMARKS

This response is submitted in response to an Office Action mailed on December 28, 2006. Claims 1-32 were pending at the time the Office Action was issued. Applicants hereby amend claims 9, 22, and 27. Claims 1-32 remain pending.

In the interest of reducing the issues to be considered in this response, the following remarks focus principally on the patentability of independent claims 1, 9, 17, 22, and 27. The patentability of each of the dependent claims is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, Applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that Applicants concur with the conclusions set forth in the Office Action that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references. Similarly, Applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every comment set forth in the Office Action, should not be considered as an admission that Applicants concur with the interpretation and assertions presented in the Office Action regarding those claims. Indeed, Applicants believe that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited. Moreover, a specific traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 OF CLAIMS 1-5, 7-8, AND 17

Claims 1-5, 7-8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as having been anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,549,218 to Gershony *et al.* (hereinafter "Gershony"). Respectfully, Applicants traverse the rejections, and submit that the claims are allowable over the reference cited to Gershony for at least the reasons explained in detail below.

Claim 1 is reproduced here

> 1. (Original) A computer-executable method, comprising:
> determining if a child window of a parent window is a legacy window;
> if so, causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer;
> retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer;
> applying a visual enhancement to the child window output; and
> composing a visual representation of the parent window with the visually enhanced child window output.

Gershony fails to teach or suggest, "*determining* if *a child window of a parent window* is a legacy window," as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

Instead, the teachings of Gershony are related to setting a style bit for a window using application programming interfaces (API), and checking the style bit and redirecting a window if the style bit indicates the window should be redirected. (Figure 3; Column 7, Lines 33-36; Column 7, Lines 63-67; Column 8, Lines 1-4).

In other words, since Gershony does not contain any teachings related to child windows, it cannot teach the determining aspect of claim 1 recited above.

Accordingly, Gershony fails to anticipate claim 1. Moreover, since claims 2-5 and 7-8 depend from claim 1, they are at least allowable due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations recited.

Likewise, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 17 is also patentable over the reference cited to Gershony for at least the following reasons. Claim 17 is reproduced here:

> 17. (Original) A computer-executable medium having computer executable components, comprising:
>
> a user component configured to create an off-screen buffer upon detecting he presence of a legacy child window of a parent window;
>
> a GDI component configured to redirect window output from the legacy child window upon being notified by the user component of the existence of the legacy child window; and
>
> a MIL component configured to apply a visual enhancement to the redirected window output in connection with composing the parent window for display on a display device.

First, Gershony fails to teach or suggest, as recited in claim 17, "a user component configured to create an off-screen buffer *upon detecting* the presence of a *legacy child window* of a *parent window*." (emphasis added). Again, as describe above, the cited reference to Gershony instead discloses setting a style bit for a window using application programming interfaces (API), and determining whether a style bit indicates that a window should be redirected. (Figure 3; Column 7, Lines 33-36; Column 8, Lines 1-4).

Second, Gershony also fails to teach, let alone suggest, as recited in claim 17, "a GDI component configured to redirect window output from the *legacy child window* upon being *notified by the user component of the existence of the legacy child window*." (emphasis added).

Instead, the cited reference to Gershony teaches triggering an application to repaint a window "as different portions of it becomes visible," and providing multiple windows in proper overlap from a screen buffer for display. (Column 2, Lines 19-25; Column 6, Lines 18-21). This disclosure of Gershony does not teach a *child window* that is part of a *parent window*, nor does it teach a GDI component being notified of the existence of a legacy *child window*.

Third, Gershony also fails to teach, let alone suggest, as recited in claim 17, "*a MIL component* configured to apply a visual enhancement to the *redirected window output* in connection *with composing the parent* window for display on a display device." (emphasis). Instead, the cited reference to Gershony teaches that:

> *An independent application* or *a system shell* utilizing the redirection function can create a 3 dimensional or other representation of the applications running on the computer. (Column 4, Lines 4-9). (emphasis added).

A media integration layer (MDL), as recited in claim 1, is neither "an independent application" nor a "system shell." Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, Gershony fails to anticipate claim 17.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 OF CLAIMS 9-13, 16 AND 22-32

Claims 9-13, 16, and 22-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as having been anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0100480 to Lupu *et al.* (hereinafter "Lupu"). Respectfully, Applicants traverse the rejections, and submit that the claims are allowable over the references cited for at least the reasons explained in detail below.

Claim 9, as amended, is reproduced here:

> 9. (Currently Amended) A computer-executable method, comprising:
>
> receiving a notification that an input event occurred, the input event including a location on a screen display, the location being within a boundary of a parent window that includes at least one child window, the parent window being compatible with a MIL component;
>
> determining where on the parent window the input event occurred by:
>
> evaluating the notification to identify which of a plurality of windows corresponds to the location;
>
> if the location is within a boundary of a non-legacy child window, evaluating where on the non-legacy child window the input event occurred;
>
> if the location is within a boundary of a legacy child window~~, the child window being a legacy window~~ that does not have native capability to interact with the MIL component, referring the notification to a legacy display component; and
>
> notifying an appropriate child window of the input event, the appropriate child window corresponding to the location.

First, Lupu fails to teach, let alone suggest, "if the location is within a boundary of a non-legacy *child window,* evaluating where on the non-legacy *child window* the input event occurred," as recited in claim 9. (emphasis added). In contrast, Lupu teaches determining whether an input event occurred in a *window* that is not set to be "redirected" by a style bit. (Paragraph 34, Lines 14-20). Put it another way, while Lupu teaches determining input events for a window that may be arguably equivalent to a *parent window*, Lupu but does not teach determining input events for a non-legacy *child window* that is included by the *parent window*.

Second, Lupu fails to teach, let alone suggest, "if the location is within a boundary of a legacy *child window* that does not have native capability to interact

with the MIL component, referring the notification to a legacy display component," as recited in claim 9. (emphasis added).

Instead, Lupu teaches determining whether an input event occurred in a "redirected" window. (Paragraph 34, Lines 14-20). However, the "redirected" window of Lupu is also, at best, arguably equivalent to a *parent window*. Thus, Lupu does not teach or suggest determining events for a specific legacy *child window* that is included by a *parent window*. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the cited reference to Lupu fails to anticipate claim 9. Moreover, since claims 9-13 and 16 depend from claim 9, they are at least allowable due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations recited.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 22 is also patentable over the reference cited for at least the following reasons. Claim 22, as amended, is reproduced here:

> 22. (Currently Amended) A computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions comprising:
>
> in a system having a display component for issuing instructions to notify a parent window <u>of a child window</u> of the creation of a redirected child window, means for notifying the parent window that the redirected child window is being or has been set up.

Specifically, Lupu teaches a windows-based operating system that sets a style bit to indicate whether *a window* is a redirected to a textured map. (Figure 2, Paragraph 27, Lines 5-26). However, Lupu does not disclose a *parent* window that includes *child windows*, or that a *child window* may be redirected while the *parent window* is not redirected.

Furthermore, Lupu also does not teach or suggest the "creation of a redirected *child window*." Instead, Lupu teaches setting a style bit so that a

window may be redirected, and transforming the input coordinates for a redirected window. (Figure 5, Paragraph 34, Lines 14-20). In other words, Lupu teaches providing inputs to a redirected *window*, rather than creating a redirected *child window* for the window.

Thus, Lupu cannot teach or suggest, "a system having a display component for issuing instructions to notifying a *parent window* of a *child window* of a *creation* of a redirected *child window*," as recited in claim 22. (emphasis added).

Moreover, Lupu also does not teach or suggest, "notifying the parent window that the redirected child window is being or has been set up," as further recited in claim 22. In contrast, as stated above, Lupu teaches determining inputs for a window and transforming the inputs if the window is a redirected window. (Figure 5, Paragraph 34, Lines 14-20). However, it does not teach or suggest that the redirected window has a *parent window*, or that the parent window may be notified once "the redirected child window is being or has been set up."

Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, Lupu fails to anticipate claim 22. Moreover, since claims 23-26 depend from claim 22, they are at least allowable due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations recited.

Specifically, claims 23-25 each recite a "redirected child window." However, as discussed above, Lupu does not teach or suggest creating redirected child windows. Thus, claims 23-25 are further allowable over Lupu.

Moreover, claim 26 is also further allowable over Lupu. Lupu does not teach or suggest a computer-readable medium, as recited in amended claim 26, wherein "*the parent window contains the redirected child window*." (emphasis added). Instead, Lupu only teaches a window that may be redirected to a textured map in entirety. (Figure 2, Paragraph 27, Lines 5-26).

Lastly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 27 is also patentable over the Lupu for at least the following reasons. Claim 27, as amended, is reproduced here:

> 27. (Currently Amended) A computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions comprising:
>
> in a system having a display component for issuing instructions to notify a parent window of a child window of the creation of a redirected child window, means for notifying the parent window of a change that affects the redirected child window.

First, Lupu cannot teach or suggest, notify "a parent window of a child window", as recited in claim 27. As discussed above, Lupu teaches a windows-based operating system that sets a style bit to indicate whether *a window* is a redirected to a textured map. (Figure 2, Paragraph 27, Lines 5-26). However, Lupu does not disclose a *parent* window that includes *child windows*, or that a *child window* may be redirected while the *parent window* is not redirected.

Second, Lupu also does not teach or suggest, "notifying the parent window of a change the affects the redirected child window," as further recited in claim 27. Instead, Lupu teaches that an application may obtain a notification of the visual update, including which window was updated and the affected region within the window. (Paragraph 28, Lines 24-27). However, this disclosure of Lupu does not teach "notifying the *parent window*."

Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, the Lupu fails to anticipate claim 27. Moreover, since claims 28-32 depend from claim 27, they are at least allowable due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations recited.

III. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103 OF CLAIM 6

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218) in view of the U.S. Patent 6,717,596 to Nason *et al.* (hereinafter "Nason").

Applicants respectfully note that the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) of the American Inventors Protection Act regarding subject matter that qualifies as anticipatory art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) apply to Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218). Accordingly, Gershony may not be used to preclude the patentability of the pending claim and the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) must be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218) qualifies as anticipatory art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because (A) Gershony is a U.S. Patent with a filing date (March 31, 1999) earlier than the effective filing date of the subject application (October 23, 2003), with a publication date (April 15, 2003) that is not more than one year prior to the effective filing date of the subject application, and (B) the inventive entity of the subject application (Blanco *et al.*) is different than that of the cited reference to Gershony. See MPEP § 706.02(a).

Furthermore, Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218) is assigned to The Microsoft Corporation. Applicants respectfully submit that, at the time the subject matter of the present application was made, it was owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same entity, namely The Microsoft Corporation, as evidenced by the assignment filed herein and recorded at Reel 014933 and Frame 0377.

Under the American Inventor's Protection Act, 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as amended provides that art "which qualifies as prior art under one or more of subsections (e) (f) and (g) of section 102 shall not preclude patentability under this

section ...where the subject matter was at the time the invention was made, was owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person." See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1). Because 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) applies, Gershony may not be used to preclude the patentability of pending claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of pending claim 6 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218) in view of Nason (U.S. 6,717,596).

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OF CLAIMS 14-15

Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupu (U.S. Pub. 2004/0100480), in view of the U.S. Patent 6,954,933 to Stall *et al.* (hereinafter "Stall").

Applicants respectfully note that the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) of the American Inventors Protection Act regarding subject matter that qualifies as anticipatory art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) apply to Lupu (U.S. Pub. 2004/0100480). Accordingly, Lupu may not be used to preclude the patentability of the pending claims and the rejection of claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) must be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that Lupu (U.S. Pub. 2004/0100480) qualifies as anticipatory art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because (A) Lupu is a U.S. Patent Application with a priority date (April 6, 2000) earlier than the effective filing date of the subject application (October 23, 2003), with a publication date (May 27, 2004) that is not more than one year prior to the effective filing date of the subject application, and (B) the inventive entity of the subject application (Blanco *et al.*) is different than that of the cited reference to Lupu. See MPEP § 706.02(a).

Furthermore, Lupu (U.S. Pub. 2004/0100480) is assigned to The Microsoft Corporation. Applicants respectfully submit that, at the time the subject matter of the present application was made, it was owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same entity, namely The Microsoft Corporation, as evidenced by the assignment filed herein and recorded at Reel 014933 and Frame 0377.

Under the American Inventor's Protection Act, 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as amended provides that art "which qualifies as prior art under one or more of subsections (e) (f) and (g) of section 102 shall not preclude patentability under this section ...where the subject matter was at the time the invention was made, was owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person." See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1). Because 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) applies, Gershony may not be used to preclude the patentability of pending claims 14-15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of pending claims 14-15 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupu (U.S. Pub. 2004/0100480) in view of Stall (U.S. 6,954,933).

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OF CLAIMS 18-19 AND 21

Claims 18-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershony in view of Stall.

Applicants respectfully note that the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) of the American Inventors Protection Act regarding subject matter that qualifies as anticipatory art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) apply to Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218). Accordingly, Gershony may not be used to preclude the patentability of the

pending claim and the rejection of claims 18-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) must be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218) qualifies as anticipatory art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because (A) Gershony is a U.S. Patent with a filing date (March 31, 1999) earlier than the effective filing date of the subject application (October 23, 2003), with a publication date (April 15, 2003) that is not more than one year prior to the effective filing date of the subject application, and (B) the inventive entity of the subject application (Blanco *et al.*) is different than that of the cited reference to Gershony. See MPEP § 706.02(a).

Furthermore, Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218) is assigned to The Microsoft Corporation. Applicants respectfully submit that, at the time the subject matter of the present application was made, it was owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same entity, namely The Microsoft Corporation, as evidenced by the assignment filed herein and recorded at Reel 014933 and Frame 0377.

Under the American Inventor's Protection Act, 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as amended provides that art "which qualifies as prior art under one or more of subsections (e) (f) and (g) of section 102 shall not preclude patentability under this section ...where the subject matter was at the time the invention was made, was owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person." See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1). Because 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) applies, Gershony may not be used to preclude the patentability of pending claims 18-19, and 21.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of pending claims 18-19 and 21 under 35 USC

§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218) in view of Stall (U.S. 6,954,933).

V. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OF CLAIM 20

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershony in view of Stall, and in further view of Nason.

Applicants respectfully note that the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) of the American Inventors Protection Act regarding subject matter that qualifies as anticipatory art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) apply to Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218). Accordingly, Gershony may not be used to preclude the patentability of the pending claim and the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) must be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218) qualifies as anticipatory art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because (A) Gershony is a U.S. Patent with a filing date (March 31, 1999) earlier than the effective filing date of the subject application (October 23, 2003), with a publication date (April 15, 2003) that is not more than one year prior to the effective filing date of the subject application, and (B) the inventive entity of the subject application (Blanco *et al.*) is different than that of the cited reference to Gershony. See MPEP § 706.02(a).

Furthermore, Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218) is assigned to The Microsoft Corporation. Applicants respectfully submit that, at the time the subject matter of the present application was made, it was owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same entity, namely The Microsoft Corporation, as evidenced by the assignment filed herein and recorded at Reel 014933 and Frame 0377.

Under the American Inventor's Protection Act, 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as amended provides that art "which qualifies as prior art under one or more of subsections (e) (f) and (g) of section 102 shall not preclude patentability under this section ...where the subject matter was at the time the invention was made, was owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person." See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1). Because 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) applies, Gershony may not be used to preclude the patentability of pending claim 20.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of pending claim 20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershony (U.S. 6,549,218) in view of Stall (U.S. 6,954,933), and in further view of Nason (U.S. 6,717,596).

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-32 are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment, as well as consideration and prompt allowance of the claims. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 3-5-07 By: Elliott Y. Chen

Elliott Y. Chen
Reg. No. 58,293
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Ave, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: (206) 315-4001 x104
or (206) 315-7914
Fax: (206) 315-4004